

Training and Outreach Workgroup Meeting March 2, 2007

Attendees: Paula Parker-Sawyer, Jeff Barber, Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Eric Martin
Dave Bozell, Sonya Cleveland, Mary Lay, Kim Manlove, Marcia French
Jessica Parks, Rebecca Smith, Tonia Richards, Carolyn Waller

Meeting was called to order by chairperson.

Report on Pre-Conference Organizational Session.

Comments/Suggestions:

- RFP/RFS rollout and agenda layout highly complimented by another State employee
- Thank you's to all involved.
- RFS to be done earlier in the session to put rest of information in context.
- Concern over consistency and consensus of answers, i.e., number of grants available, number of MOUs Local Coordinating Councils could sign, requirements of hiring two employees, etc. Moderator was suggested to preside over Q & A period.

It was discussed that all questions and answers will be sent to all participants of all sessions as well as posted on the website. Chair suggested that Kim and Marcia call an immediate meeting of the workgroup chairs to work through the critical operational questions and 'develop the law.'

The panel of Expert Review Team reviewers is being developed. Please provide your suggestions for potential members were asked to Jeff Barber by Thursday, March 8th, noon.

Agenda discussion for Regional TA Workshops

For consistency purposes, it was recommended that answers would not be provided during the Regional Technical Assistance Workshops. During the Q & A period, it was also recommended that one person moderate to determine whether the question is answered or not. For consistency purposes, it was decided that no answers be given to attendees aside from points of clarification. Attendees and applicants are encouraged to read answers on the website when posted.

Power Point Presentation. It was determined that the power point used from yesterday's session be used for the TA workshops. To continue with the consistency of messaging, new slides should not be developed.

Suggested handouts: 5-step SPF process; 'Prevention' definition

Review of Questions and Answers

The following are the suggested answers to the corresponding questions asked during yesterday's session.

1. Paul will send wording.
2. No.

3. 1.98 million annually for four years to the State.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Up to the annually awarded amount to the State of Indiana.
7. Yes. Contact OFBCI (list website address)
8. Yes.
9. See Question 6.
10. See Question 5.
11. The grant review process will provide checks and balances.
12. Insert language from CAPT training.
13. Sonya to provide.
14. Both will be reviewed.
15. All applications will be reviewed independently.
16. Both lines should be signed by chair/president of the Local Coordinating Council.
17. Yes. You may reproduce the Letter of Interest in the RFS.
18. Yes. Yes.
19. Based on accepted data collection protocol.
20. It was not intended to be difficult. All care has been taken to ensure that all information is clear and understandable. Yes.
21. Eric Wright to be consulted (a); Yes.
22. The development of criteria of counties not classified as high need must be determined by the applicant.
23. It is recommended.
24. Yes.
25. No.
26. See handout.
27. Benefits should be based on the applicant's agency personnel policies.
28. Yes.

Expert Peer Review Model

The list of reviewers was discussed. Potential conflicts of interest were also discussed. It was suggested that the parameters for the expert peer review panel be reviewed.

Miscellaneous

We should be careful not to interpret for the communities.

It was suggested that IPRC's grants resource person or Community Consultants not provide any technical assistance until after the answers have been posted. If applicable, encourage attendees/applicants submit questions to the website and encourage them to review all of the answers on the website after they have been posted.